

Talent	Torres	Weldon (PA)
Tanner	Traficant	Weller
Tauscher	Turner	Wexler
Tauzin	Upton	Weygand
Taylor (MS)	Velazquez	White
Taylor (NC)	Vento	Whitfield
Thomas	Visclosky	Wicker
Thompson	Walsh	Wise
Thornberry	Waters	Wolf
Thune	Watt (NC)	Woolsey
Thurman	Watts (OK)	Wynn
Tiahrt	Waxman	Yates
Tierney	Weldon (FL)	Young (AK)

NAYS—8

Campbell	Kingston	Scarborough
Chenoweth	Paul	Wamp
Coburn	Sanford	

NOT VOTING—21

Ackerman	Greenwood	Meehan
Bateman	Hefner	Paxon
Brown (CA)	Inglis	Rush
Cannon	Istook	Smith (OR)
Christensen	John	Towns
Dixon	Kennedy (MA)	Watkins
Gonzalez	Maloney (NY)	Young (FL)

□ 1817

Mr. WAMP and Mr. SCARBOROUGH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that she will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on the additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE
RESOLUTION ACT OF 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3528, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3528, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 2, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

YEAS—405

Abercrombie	Barr	Bilirakis
Aderholt	Barrett (NE)	Bishop
Allen	Barrett (WI)	Blagojevich
Andrews	Bartlett	Bliley
Archer	Barton	Blumenauer
Armey	Bass	Blunt
Bachus	Becerra	Boehner
Baesler	Bentsen	Bonilla
Baker	Bereuter	Bonior
Baldacci	Berman	Bono
Ballenger	Berry	Borski
Barcia	Bilbray	Boswell

Boucher	Goode	McDade
Boyd	Goodlatte	McDermott
Brady	Goodling	McGovern
Brown (FL)	Gordon	McHale
Brown (OH)	Goss	McHugh
Bryant	Graham	McInnis
Bunning	Granger	McIntosh
Burr	Green	McIntyre
Burton	Gutierrez	McKeon
Buyer	Gutknecht	McKinney
Callahan	Hall (OH)	McNulty
Calvert	Hall (TX)	Meek (FL)
Camp	Hamilton	Meeks (NY)
Campbell	Hansen	Menendez
Canady	Harman	Metcalf
Capps	Hastert	Mica
Cardin	Hastings (FL)	Millender-
Carson	Hastings (WA)	McDonald
Castle	Hayworth	Miller (CA)
Chabot	Hefley	Miller (FL)
Chambliss	Herger	Minge
Chenoweth	Hill	Mink
Clay	Hilleary	Moakley
Clayton	Hilliard	Mollohan
Clement	Hinchey	Moran (KS)
Clyburn	Hinojosa	Moran (VA)
Coble	Hobson	Morella
Coburn	Hoekstra	Murtha
Collins	Holden	Myrick
Combest	Hooley	Nadler
Condit	Horn	Neal
Cook	Hostettler	Nethercutt
Cooksey	Houghton	Neumann
Costello	Hoyer	Ney
Cox	Hulshof	Northup
Coyne	Hunter	Norwood
Cramer	Hutchinson	Nussle
Crane	Hyde	Oberstar
Crapo	Jackson (IL)	Obey
Cubin	Jackson-Lee	Olver
Cummings	(TX)	Ortiz
Cunningham	Jefferson	Owens
Danner	Jenkins	Oxley
Davis (FL)	Johnson (CT)	Packard
Davis (IL)	Johnson (WI)	Pallone
Deal	Johnson, E. B.	Pappas
DeFazio	Johnson, Sam	Parker
DeGette	Jones	Pascrell
DeLauro	Kanjorski	Pastor
DeLay	Kaptur	Paul
Deutsch	Kasich	Payne
Diaz-Balart	Kelly	Pease
Dickey	Kennedy (RI)	Pelosi
Dicks	Kennelly	Peterson (MN)
Dingell	Kildee	Peterson (PA)
Doggett	Kilpatrick	Petri
Dooley	Kim	Pickering
Doolittle	Kind (WI)	Pickett
Doyle	King (NY)	Pitts
Dreier	Kingston	Pombo
Duncan	Klecza	Pomeroy
Dunn	Klink	Porter
Edwards	Klug	Portman
Ehlers	Knollenberg	Poshard
Ehrlich	Kolbe	Price (NC)
Emerson	Kucinich	Pryce (OH)
Engel	LaFalce	Quinn
English	LaHood	Radanovich
Ensign	Lampson	Rahall
Eshoo	Lantos	Ramstad
Etheridge	Largent	Rangel
Evans	Latham	Regula
Everett	LaTourette	Reyes
Ewing	Lazio	Riggs
Farr	Leach	Riley
Fattah	Lee	Rivers
Fawell	Levin	Rodriguez
Fazio	Lewis (CA)	Roemer
Filner	Lewis (GA)	Rogan
Foley	Lewis (KY)	Rogers
Forbes	Linder	Rohrabacher
Fossella	Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen
Fowler	Livingston	Rothman
Fox	LoBiondo	Roukema
Frank (MA)	Lofgren	Roybal-Allard
Frank (NJ)	Lowey	Royce
Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Ryun
Frost	Luther	Sabo
Furse	Maloney (CT)	Salmon
Galleghy	Maloney (NY)	Sanchez
Ganske	Manton	Sanders
Gejdenson	Manzullo	Sandlin
Gekas	Markey	Sanford
Gephardt	Martinez	Sawyer
Gibbons	Mascara	Saxton
Gilchrist	Matsui	Scarborough
Gillmor	McCarthy (MO)	Schaefer, Dan
Gilman	McCarthy (NY)	Schaffer, Bob
	McCollum	Schumer

Scott	Stabenow	Turner
Sensenbrenner	Stark	Upton
Serrano	Stearns	Velazquez
Sessions	Stenholm	Vento
Shadegg	Stokes	Visclosky
Shaw	Strickland	Walsh
Shays	Stump	Wamp
Sherman	Stupak	Waters
Shimkus	Sununu	Watt (NC)
Shuster	Talent	Watts (OK)
Sisisky	Tanner	Waxman
Skaggs	Tauscher	Weldon (PA)
Skeen	Tauzin	Weller
Skelton	Taylor (MS)	Wexler
Smith (MI)	Taylor (NC)	Weygand
Smith (NJ)	Thomas	White
Smith (TX)	Thompson	Whitfield
Smith, Adam	Thornberry	Wicker
Smith, Linda	Thune	Wise
Snowbarger	Thurman	Wolf
Snyder	Tiahrt	Woolsey
Solomon	Tierney	Wynn
Souder	Torres	Yates
Spence	Towns	Young (AK)
Spratt	Traficant	

NAYS—2

Boehlert

Slaughter

NOT VOTING—25

Ackerman	Gonzalez	Paxon
Bateman	Greenwood	Redmond
Brown (CA)	Hefner	Rush
Cannon	Inglis	Smith (OR)
Christensen	Istook	Watkins
Conyers	John	Weldon (FL)
Davis (VA)	Kennedy (MA)	Young (FL)
Dixon	McCrery	
Ford	Meehan	

□ 1826

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARENTS NEED TO PAY MORE AT-
TENTION TO DRUG USE OF CHIL-
DREN

(Mr. MCCOLLUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, yesterday I was looking around for something and could not find it, but today I found it, the editorial in the Wall Street Journal entitled "The Dope on Spring." I commend it to my colleagues to read about marijuana and the fact that our parents of our kids today are not paying enough attention to drug use in this country.

It says, 71 percent of teenagers said in a recent poll by Partnership for a Drug-Free America that they had friends who use marijuana, and half of them admitted that they did. This editorial points that fact out.

It also points out that only 21 percent of parents believe that their own children partake in it. The facts are, the Journal goes on to say, that, as opposed to 25 or 30 years ago today, even soft drugs like marijuana can be as much as 10 times more potent than the joints that parents toked. That is because of hydroponic strains and a lot of other things.

They also point out, though, that polls show that 82 percent of these parents believe drugs are a serious problem nationally, but only 6 percent

think the problems exist in their local high schools. They go on to say, earth to parents, it is spring, and it may be time for a chat.

I would suggest everybody needs to take a chat with a youngster today, and I commend your reading this Wall Street Journal editorial.

The text of the Wall Street Journal editorial is as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal]

REVIEW & OUTLOOK—THE DOPE ON SPRING

About this time last year, a forwarded email message was making the rounds of college campuses. "Don't forget," the message advised, "the appropriate greeting is 'hi, how are you?' not 'how high are you?'"

This month, while grown-ups were busy preparing tax returns, a lot of their college-attending children were partaking in the annual springtime bacchanalian festivals either in warmer climes or in on-campus celebrations of some meaningful date in their school's history. On these occasions many of the students ingest a cornucopia of drugs that most of their parents (despite imagined babyboomer sophistication) have never heard of.

Nor does it seem they have much interest in knowing what's going on. Despite all the attention given to drug abuse, parents are apparently disinclined to believe that their kids are using drugs. In a study released last week by the Partnership for a Drug-Free America, 71% of teenagers said they "had friends who use" marijuana and almost half admitted they themselves had tried it. But only 21% of parents thought that their little angels might partake (admittedly even that must go down as a higher percentage than their own parents would have conceded).

In fact, this is a drug "culture" with frightening differences from the glory days of 25 or 30 years ago. Today even "soft" drugs like marijuana can be as much as 10 times more potent than the joints their parents smoked. Because of crackdowns or smuggling, the neighborhood greenhouse business has flourished: New strains like "hydroponic," where the plants are grown without soil and "wet"—marijuana soaked in formaldehyde—have been increasing the drug's potency exponentially. Meanwhile, drug use among teenagers has doubled since 1990.

Other drugs, like methamphetamine, are also the product of basement alchemy, often involving youths producing it, which in turn introduces some of them to criminal enterprises. There are substantial profit margins in this new underworld for chemists who turn over-the-counter cold medicines into a particularly wicked concoction called "ice," "crank" or speed." Costing \$5 to \$25 a dose, it offers a high similar to powder cocaine, which retails at upward of \$100 a gram, but it is much more accessible to a middle-schooler's allowance. And these laboratories are proliferating.

Something else that's new: The spread of black-market pharmaceuticals like Ritalin and Ephedrine, which have become a hot commodity in many suburban neighborhoods. Last November, a group of suburban middle-schoolers got hauled in by Virginia police when the principal caught a seventh grader selling his Ritalin prescription to his pals. Other favorites come right off the store shelves: Krylon gold paint for inhaling and whipped-cream cans for nitrous oxide.

Last April, a 16-year old in a Chicago suburb was caught with 37 grams of marijuana, some opium and paraphernalia stashed in his parents' house. A 15-year-old set up shop selling pot, PCP, Ecstasy and Special K in an affluent District of Columbia suburb. These aren't just the kids from the wrong side of

the tracks. Ask any college student about the prevalence and diversity of the new chemical culture. You'll get an education.

For the '70s generation, famous for its hedonistic experimentalism, the statistics suggest a willful ignorance. Parents disbelieve, perhaps because they're afraid to find out the truth. Polls show that 82% believe drugs are a "serious problem nationally," but only 6% think the problem exists in their local high school.

The baby-boomers' self-indulgence has come home to roots, only this time there's no ideological crutch. What's becoming increasingly obvious is that Gen-X drug use involves teenagers who've rejected their parents' political ideals but adopted their libertinism. A 1995 study by the University of Michigan revealed that after a 13-year lull, teenage drug use had climbed three years in a row. Yet nearly one kid in three claimed that his or her parents have never discussed drugs with them. Only a quarter say it's a topic of frequent conversation.

Earth to parents: It's spring, and it might be time for a chat.

□ 1830

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

RANDOM DRUG TESTING OF HOUSE MEMBERS AND STAFF IS ILL-ADVISED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, the House is about to implement rule changes that will require random drug testing of all House Members and staff. Drug usage in this country, both legal and illegal, is a major problem and deserves serious attention. However, the proposal to test randomly individuals as a method to cut down on drug usage is ill-advised and should not be done.

The real issue here is not drugs but rather the issues of privacy, due process, probable cause and the fourth amendment. We are dealing with a constitutional issue of the utmost importance. It raises the question of whether or not we understand the overriding principle of the fourth amendment.

A broader but related question is whether or not it is the government's role to mold behavior, any more than it is the government's role to mold, regulate, tax and impede voluntary economic contractual arrangements.

No one advocates prior restraint to regulate journalistic expression, even though great harm has come over the century from the promotion of authoritarian ideas. Likewise, we do not advocate the regulation of political expression and religious beliefs, however bizarre and potentially harmful they may seem.

Yet we casually assume it is the role of government to regulate personal be-

havior to make one act more responsibly. A large number of us in this Chamber do not call for the regulation or banning of guns because someone might use a gun in an illegal fashion. We argue that it is the criminal that needs regulated and refuse to call for diminishing the freedom of law-abiding citizens because some individual might commit a crime with a gun.

Random drug testing is based on the same assumption made by anti-gun proponents. Unreasonable efforts at identifying the occasional and improbable drug user should not replace respect for our privacy. It is not worth it.

While some Members are more interested in regulating economic transactions in order to make a fairer society, there are others here who are more anxious to regulate personal behavior to make a good society. But both cling to the failed notion that governments, politicians and bureaucrats know what is best for everyone. If we casually allow our persons to be searched, why is it less important that our conversations, our papers and our telephones not be monitored as well? Vital information regarding drugs might be obtained in this manner as well. Especially we who champion the cause of limited government ought not be the promoters of the roving eye of Big Brother.

If we embark on this course to check randomly all congressional personnel for possible drug usage, it might be noted that the two most dangerous and destructive drugs in this country are alcohol and nicotine. To not include these in the efforts to do good is inconsistent, to say the least. Unfortunately, the administration is now pursuing an anti-tobacco policy that will be even less successful than the ill-fated Federal war on drugs.

I have one question for my colleagues: If we have so little respect for our own privacy, our own liberty and our own innocence, how can we be expected to protect the liberties, the privacy and the innocence of our constituents, which we have sworn an oath to do?

Those promoting these drug testing rules are well motivated, just as are those who promote economic welfare legislation. Members with good intentions attempting to solve social problems perversely use government power and inevitably hurt innocent people while rarely doing anything to prevent the anticipated destructive behavior of a few.

It is said that if one has nothing to hide, why object to testing? Because, quite simply, we have something to keep: our freedom, our privacy and the fourth amendment. The only answer to solving problems like this is to encourage purely voluntary drug testing, whereby each individual and each Member of the House makes the information available to those who are worried about issues like this.